UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,463	03/12/2004	Dennis W. Minium JR.	MS307207.01 / MSFTP586US	7693

27195 7590 03/18/2009

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
ZHEN, LI B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/18/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,463	MINIUM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LI B. ZHEN	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 December 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,17-21,23-33 and 38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,17-21,23-33 and 38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 13, 17 – 21, 23 – 33 and 38 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 1 – 13, 17 – 21 and 23 – 33 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,174,348 to Sadhu et al. [hereinafter Sadhu] in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,069,547 to Glaser.**

6. As to claim 1, Sadhu teaches a system that facilitates the interface of non-integrated applications [col. 3, lines 26 – 32], comprising:

a processor coupled to memory that retains [col. 3, lines 40 – 48]:

an artifact provider [submodule 31c-1; col. 7, lines 4 – 24] that hosts artifacts of a first application [software development tool integration module 31c, Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 20 – 31], each artifact is associated with an artifact type, the artifact type can be at least one of a source file [a fifth artifact which is the source code; col. 2, lines 59 – 61 and col. 7, lines 4 – 24], a defect, a requirement [functional specifications; col. 7, lines 4 – 24 and col. 6, lines 6 – 23], a test result [test documents; col. 7, lines 4 – 24] or a build; and

an artifact consumer [collaboration module; col. 5, lines 35 – 49] that host artifacts [PERSON object 41d; col. 15, lines 21 – 36] of a second application [col. 17, lines 35 – 49], the artifact consumer further includes at least one reference [col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57], each of the at least one reference is associated with one referring artifact hosted by the second application and is a link to one referenced artifact of the first application hosted by the artifact provider [submodule 31d-1 insures that nobody takes part in the review unless they are represented by one of the PERSON objects 41d which are linked to one of the REVIEWER objects 41t in the database 32; col. 17, line 35 – col. 18, line 20], the link further comprises a link type

that describes a relationship between the referring artifact of the second application and the referenced artifact of the first application [PROCESS object which is linked by a plurality of relationships to many other different types of objects; col. 5, lines 32 – 48; col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57]. Sadhu does not specifically disclose the artifacts as including items of data the first application publicly exposes to other applications.

However, Glaser teaches artifacts as including items of data the first application publicly exposes to other applications [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Sadhu to incorporate the features of Glaser. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the combination because this provides a program for analyzing proposed changes to program statements in a source code file [col. 2, lines 22 – 35 of Glaser].

7. As to claim 23, Sadhu as modified teaches a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method for facilitating an interface between non-integrated applications [col. 3, lines 26 – 32 of Sadhu], the method comprising:

providing an artifact provider [submodule 31c-1; col. 7, lines 4 – 24 of Sadhu] that communicates with a first non-integrated application [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60 of Glaser];

exposing a referenced artifact hosted by the first application via the artifact provider [submodule 31c-1; col. 7, lines 4 – 24 of Sadhu], the artifact comprises an item of public data of the first application [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60 of Glaser];

providing an artifact consumer that communicates with a second non-integrated application [collaboration module; col. 5, lines 35 – 49 of Sadhu], the second application includes a referring artifact that is an item of public data of the second application [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60 of Glaser];

exposing a reference held by second application and the referring artifact associated [col. 15, lines 21 – 36 of Sadhu] with the reference via the artifact consumer [col. 5, lines 35 – 49 of Sadhu]; and

linking the referring artifact to the referenced artifact via the reference that includes an artifact identifier [col. 17, line 35 – col. 18, line 20 of Sadhu] of the referenced artifact [col. 5, lines 32 – 48; col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57 of Sadhu].

8. As to claim 38, Sadhu as modified teaches a computer-implemented system that facilitates data integration among one or more non-integrated applications in a development environment [col. 3, lines 26 – 32 of Sadhu], comprising:

at least one processor, coupled to a memory, that executes the following computer-executable components [col. 3, lines 40 – 48]:

an integration service in the development environment [software development tool integration module 31c, Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 20 – 31 of Sadhu] that includes one or more nonintegrated applications [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60 of Glaser] that each comprise at least one artifact [col. 2, lines 59 – 61 and col. 7, lines 4 – 24 of Sadhu], the integration service comprises:

a first application [col. 5, lines 20 – 31 of Sadhu] and a second application [col. 17, lines 35 – 49 of Sadhu] that each include one or more artifacts [col. 7, lines 4 – 24 and col. 6, lines 6 – 23 of Sadhu], the one or more artifacts are items of data of the applications that are publicly exposed [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60 of Glaser], the one or more artifacts include artifact types and unique artifact identifiers [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser];

an artifact provider [col. 7, lines 4 – 24 of Sadhu] associated with the first application, the artifact provider that facilitates exposing at least a referenced artifact [col. 7, lines 3 – 24 of Sadhu] of the first application [col. 4, lines 30 – 50 and col. 5, lines 30 – 60 of Glaser];

an artifact consumer [col. 5, lines 35 – 49 of Sadhu] associated with the second application, the artifact consumer that facilitates exposing at least a referring artifact of the second application [col. 15, lines 21 – 36 of Sadhu] and a reference associated with the referring artifact [col. 17, line 35 – col. 18, line 20 of Sadhu], the reference includes an artifact identifier corresponding to the referring artifact exposed by the artifact provider [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser]; and

a linking component that facilitates creation of a link between the referring artifact and the referenced artifact via the reference included in the artifact consumer [col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57 of Sadhu], the link includes a link type that indicates a type of relationship between the referring artifact and the referenced artifact [col. 5, lines 32 – 48; col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57 of Sadhu].

9. As to claim 2, Sadhu as modified teaches the link is a uniform resource identifier (URI) [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser].

10. As to claim 3, Sadhu teaches the artifact provider and the artifact consumer are application program interfaces (APIs) that interface to the respective applications [col. 5, lines 25 – 31].

11. As to claim 4, Sadhu teaches a linking component that links the reference with the corresponding artifact of the first application [col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57].

12. As to claim 5, Sadhu as modified teaches the linking component is an artifact identifier held by the artifact consumer that points to an artifact [col. 13, lines 13 – 19 of Glaser].

13. As to claim 6, Sadhu as modified teaches the link is a binary link [col. 13, lines 13 – 19 of Glaser].

14. As to claim 7, Sadhu teaches at least one of the provider and the consumer is a tool or service [col. 7, lines 4 – 24].

15. As to claim 8, Sadhu teach the artifact provider registers an artifact type for each artifact it provides, and registers a corresponding link type that each artifact can host [col. 18, lines 15 – 20].

16. As to claim 9, Sadhu teaches a generic artifact provider (GAP) that interfaces to a tool to facilitate storing and exposing both artifacts and artifact links [col. 3, lines 56 – 65].

17. As to claim 10, Sadhu teaches a GAP adapter that provides an interface between the GAP and a non-integrated application [col. 3, lines 56 – 65].

18. As to claim 11, Sadhu teaches a cache that stores the artifacts and associated artifact links [database 32; col. 5, lines 32 – 47 and col. 8, lines 6 – 23].

19. As to claim 12, Sadhu teaches a user interface that facilitates presenting inter-artifact references [col. 5, lines 11 – 19].

20. As to claim 13, Sadhu teaches a computer readable storage medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carrying out the system of claim 1 [col. 3, lines 40 – 48].

21. As to claim 17, Sadhu as modified teaches the link is an artifact identifier that is an immutable and uniquely constructed key [col. 4, lines 57 – 62 of Glaser].

22. As to claim 18, Sadhu teaches a link manager that manages a cache by updating and purging cache contents [col. 12, lines 48 – 59].

23. As to claim 19, Sadhu teaches the artifact provider and artifact consumer are at least one of loosely coupled and tightly coupled [col. 12, lines 36 – 47].

24. As to claim 20, Sadhu teaches a classifier that makes an inference based on parameters related to at least one of the artifact consumer, artifact provider, and non-integrated applications [col. 11, lines 41 – 49].

25. As to claim 21, Sadhu as modified teaches the artifact provider creates and reveals a URI [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser] for at least one of loosely-coupled server-based interactions, loosely-coupled clients, caching, and tightly-coupled interactions

that support artifact-specific functions by contract with a caller [col. 12, lines 36 – 47 of Sadhu].

26. As to claim 24, Sadhu teaches registering an artifact type for the referring artifact and the referenced artifact; and registering a link type that the referring artifact and the reference artifact hosts [col. 18, lines 15 – 20].

27. As to claim 25, Sadhu teaches presenting dependency information of the referenced artifact to a user, the information including at least one of link type [col. 14, lines 15 of Sadhu], artifact type [col. 5, lines 32 – 48; col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57 of Sadhu], artifact name [col. 14, lines 5 – 17 of Sadhu], and modification date [col. 15, lines 50 – 55 of Sadhu].

28. As to claim 26, Sadhu as modified teaches at least one of the artifact consumer or artifact provider is a web service [col. 11, line 66 – col. 12, 32 of Glaser].

29. As to claim 27, Sadhu as modified teaches generating an artifact proxy that represents data stored in a non-integrated application [col. 12, lines 33 – 62 of Glaser].

30. As to claim 28, Sadhu teaches the referenced artifact and referring artifact are representative of at least one of a source file [a fifth artifact which is the source code; col. 2, lines 59 – 61 and col. 7, lines 4 – 24], defect, requirement [functional

specifications; col. 7, lines 4 – 24 and col. 6, lines 6 – 23], test result [test documents; col. 7, lines 4 – 24], or build.

31. As to claim 29, Sadhu as modified teaches linking comprises creating a link between the referring artifact and the referenced artifact that includes a referring URI [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser], a referenced URI [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser], and a link type [col. 5, lines 32 – 48; col. 5, lines 32 – 58; col. 9, lines 5 – 13 and lines 50 – 57 of Sadhu].

32. As to claim 30, Sadhu teaches discovering which referring artifacts hold links to a specific referenced artifact [col. 11, lines 21 – 31].

33. As to claim 31, Sadhu teaches raising an event when the referenced artifact is at least one of created, deleted, and changed [col. 5, lines 59 – 67].

34. As to claim 32, Sadhu teaches providing external addressability for the referenced artifact by the artifact provider [col. 12, lines 1 – 2 of Glaser].

35. As to claim 33, Sadhu teaches providing a generic API that is both an artifact provider and an artifact consumer [col. 3, lines 56 – 65].

Conclusion

36. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Li B. Zhen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

Li B. Zhen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2194